

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Ismail Dickerson,

PLAINTIFF

v.

State of South Carolina; Governor
Henry McMaster; City of Myrtle Beach;
Brenda Bethune; Kate E. Miller; Doris
Clemmons; Cheryl Finkel; Magistrate
Judge Dana Pfeiffer Jones,

DEFENDANTS

Case No. 4:21-cv-00110-TLW

Order

Plaintiff Ismail Dickerson, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant. ECF No. 1. The matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. ECF No. 8. In the Report, the magistrate judge recommends that Plaintiff's case be summarily dismissed. *Id.* Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report. This matter is now ripe for decision.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, "a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the

record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report. For the reasons stated by the magistrate judge, the Report, ECF No. 8, is **ACCEPTED**. This action is hereby **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Senior United States District Judge

February 12, 2021
Columbia, South Carolina